

LABOUR DEPARTMENT

The 18th/19th May, 1979

No. 11(112)3 Lab-79/5056.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. X of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman Shri Rama Pati Yadav and the management of M/s. Grover Enterprises, 1st. Mile, Narela Kundli Road (Sonepat).

BEFORE SHRI BABU RAM GOYAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 258 of 1978

between

SHRI RAMA PATI YADAV, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. GROVER ENTERPRISES 1ST MILE, NARELA KUNDLI ROAD (SONEPAT)

Present :—

Nemo for the workman.

Shri Kanwal Singh, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/SPT-17/78/41342, dated 12th September, 1978, the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between the management of M/s. Grover Enterprises, 1st. Mile, Narela Kundli road, Sonepat and its workman Shri Rama Pati Yadav to this court, for adjudication, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (d) of the sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Rama Pati Yadav was justified and in order ?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of order of reference, notices were issued to the parties. The management appeared, but the workman, did not appear and notice was issued to summon the workman again for 5th January, 1979. The workman did not appear on 5th January, 1979 and registered notices were issued for 7th March, 1979. On failure of the workman to appear Registered notice issued for 11th April, 1979. The acknowledgment receipt of the notice for 11th April, 1979 is placed on the file and inspite of service of notice no one on behalf of the workman has appeared right from the beginning neither the workman nor any authorised representative on his behalf is taking part in the proceedings before the court though numerous notices have been issued and served on the workman. I think the workman is no longer interested in pursuing his claim. He has not filed even his claim-statement. In these circumstances I dismiss this reference in default of the appearance of the workman and answer the same that the termination of the services of the workman is justified and in order and the workman is not entitled to any relief.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Dated the 15th April, 1979.

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak,

Endst. No. 258/78/985, dated the 4th May, 1979.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

BABU RAM GOYAL,

Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

K. K. SHARMA,
Commissioner & Secy.